

enqa

TEEP 2002

TRANS-NATIONAL EUROPEAN EVALUATION PROJECT (TEEP 2002)

Evaluation Manual

Revised edition



Education and Culture

1. Background for the TEEP project

1.1 The Bologna declaration

Any European perspective on the quality of higher education has since 1999 been strongly influenced by the processes of the follow up to the Bologna Declaration of that year, signed by 29 European Ministers of Education. By signing this declaration the Ministers agreed on coordinating their policies to reach a number of objectives, which they consider to be of primary relevance in order to establish a European area of higher education and also to promote the European system of higher education worldwide. Their agreed objectives, with a target date of 2010, are:

- adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, also through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to promote European citizens' employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher education system;
- adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries;
- establishment of a system of credits - such as in the ECTS system - as proper means of promoting the most widespread student mobility. Credits could also be acquired in non-higher education contexts, including lifelong learning, provided they are recognised by the receiving universities concerned;
- promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement with particular attention to:
 1. students, access to study and training opportunities and related services.
 2. teachers, researchers and administrative staff, recognition and valorisation of periods spent in a European context researching, teaching and training, without prejudicing their statutory rights;
- **promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance with a view to develop comparable criteria and methodologies;**
- promotion of the necessary European dimensions in higher education, particularly with regard to curricular development, inter-institutional cooperation, mobility schemes and integrated programmes of study, training and research.

The ministers undertook 'to attain these objectives - within the framework of our institutional competences and taking full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and of university autonomy - to consolidate the European area of higher education' and stated further that 'To that end, we will pursue the ways of intergovernmental cooperation, together with those of non-governmental European organisations with competence on higher education. We expect Universities to again respond promptly and positively and to contribute actively to the success of our endeavour.'

This general background, and the subsequent initiatives and developments between the ministerial meetings in Bologna and Prague and beyond, have provided the major motivation for setting up the Trans-national European Evaluation Project (TEEP). TEEP is supported by the European Commission through the SOCRATES programme. It is part of a package of measures initiated by the European Commission in order to stimulate the Bologna Process (from Prague to Berlin, the EU-contribution). The project is coordinated through the European Network of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) with the participation of the SOCRATES Thematic Networks of the three disciplines history, physics and veterinary science contributing to the project. Representatives of ENQA, the chairpersons of the SOCRATES Thematic Networks, the European Commission and representatives of the responsible quality assurance agencies constitute the management group of the project. (See annex 5 for a list of the management group members.)

1.2 European trans-national projects on quality in higher education

There are a number of projects that are of particular relevance to the establishment and development of TEEP. The most important projects are :

- the wide-ranging *European Pilot Project* conducted in 1994/1995, supported by the European Commission. Seventeen countries, the fifteen EU members as well as Norway and Iceland, were involved in this project in which a total number of no less than 46 programs within higher education were evaluated simultaneously. The main idea of the project was to test a common methodology for programme evaluations, which was at the same time suitable for national adaptations.
- the international evaluation of electrical engineering programmes in Belgium, The Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden and Germany, initiated by the Dutch Quality Assurance Agency, VSNU, and conducted in 1991/1992. The purpose of this project was to reach a mutual understanding and recognition of diplomas of the chosen programmes across the countries involved.
- the international research project initiated by CHEPS (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies) and conducted by researchers from The Netherlands, Germany and UK is another example of an international evaluation. In this project from 1991/1992 ten programmes of economy from the three countries mentioned above were evaluated. The project was primarily oriented towards methodological development. More specifically the aim was to develop a valid, reliable and effective methodology for comparing educational quality across the systems of higher education in a number of European countries.
- the two-year project *Tuning Educational Structures in Europe* launched in May 2001 organised by European universities and supported by the European Commission through the SOCRATES programme (<http://www.relint.deusto.es/TUNINGProject/index.htm>). The project aims within the context of the Bologna process to "tune" educational structures in Europe, open a debate on the nature and the importance of subject-specific and general competences involving stakeholders, identify subject-specific and general competences and lastly develop the use of ECTS credits. The first phase of the project came to an end in May 2002 and a second phase to test the key findings in the project is now being envisaged by the coordinators.
- the *Cross-border Quality Assessment of Physics* conducted in 2000/2001 that involved five programmes from four universities placed in three different countries. Four national/regional quality assurance agencies were involved in the conduction of the evaluation. The aim of the project was to compare the programmes and to analyse whether students received equivalent qualifications. The method applied for the evaluation drew heavily on the lessons learned from the evaluation of engineering programmes mentioned above. The overall approach with an international committee responsible for formulating minimum requirements and conducting the site visits resembled the one used in the evaluation of engineering programmes. However, the principles behind the

composition of the international committee differed. In the physics evaluation it was decided that the committee members should all be independent of the participating institutions.

- the *International Comparative Evaluation of Programmes in Agricultural Science* conducted by The Danish Evaluation Institute (EVA). The evaluation includes programmes offered in Denmark, Germany, Ireland and The Netherlands. The evaluation is a Danish reflection of the Bologna process and the specific objective of promoting European cooperation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies.

European ministers have recognized the vital role that quality assurance systems play in ensuring high quality standards and facilitating the comparability of qualifications throughout Europe. They have also encouraged closer cooperation between recognition and quality assurance networks and sought to promote European cooperation in quality assurance.

Whilst debates continue about the relative roles and merits of different quality assurance approaches several notable initiatives have been established. These include:

- development of the roles of ENQA. Reflecting on the Bologna process, the EU Ministers of Education have assigned responsibility for the quality assurance development in Higher Education to the ENQA Network. The ENQA Network is supported by the European Commission through the SOCRATES Network. ENQA have taken actions to disseminate information, experiences, good practices and new developments in the field of quality assessment and quality assurance in higher education between interested parties, public authorities, higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies;
- the pilot scheme 'Promoting a "quality culture" in universities' will help universities to introduce internal quality assurance mechanisms that they can consider their own. The project is supported by the European Commission and conducted by the European University Association (EUA) (<http://www.unige.ch/eua/>). The expected outcome is to create a critical mass of universities having concrete experience with internal quality assurance mechanisms helping them to improve their quality levels and being better prepared for external evaluations;
- the Joint Quality Initiative supported by the Dutch and Flemish governments, and in particular the development of shared descriptors for Bachelors and Masters degrees (<http://www.jointquality.org/>).

1.3 TEEP: an outline

Because of the increasing interest and emphasis on quality assurance as a method to assure transparency and e.g. comparability of the recognition of degrees within Europe, TEEP has been established to seek to develop a European methodology for the use of common criteria and quality assurance at European level.

The project will encompass 5 institutions in each of 3 discipline areas and seek to cover as wide a range of national and European contexts as possible. The project includes both academic and professional discipline areas through its selection of History, Physics and Veterinary Sciences as the three discipline areas involved. The project will draw directly on the findings in terms of definitions of competences of the Tuning project. The link with Tuning and the SOCRATES Thematic Networks is assured by the participation of the chairpersons of the three participating SOCREATES Thematic Networks in the TEEP management group:

Discipline Area	SORATES Thematic Network	Chairperson/contactperson

History	CLIOH – European History Network	Prof. Ann Katherine Isaacs isaacs@stm.unipi.it
Veterinary Sciences	ICEVE - Interaction and Co-operation in European Veterinary education	Prof. Tito Fernandes titofernandes@fmv.utl.pt;
Physics	EUPEN - European Physics Education Network	Prof. Hendrik Ferdinande hendrik.ferdinande@rug.ac.be

Three established quality assurance agencies have combined their expertise to oversee the programme of work, with each agency taking particular responsibility for one of the discipline areas:

Discipline area	Agency	Contact	E-mail
History	QAAHE – The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (UK)	Nick Harris	n.harris@qaa.ac.uk
Veterinary Sciences	AQU - Agency for Quality Assurance in the Catalan University System) (Catalonia)	Josep Grifoll	jgrifollsaori@agenqua.org
Physics	EVA – The Danish Evaluation Institute (Denmark)	Tine Holm	tih@eva.dk

1.4 Objectives of TEEP

The main objectives of TEEP are:

- to develop further a method for trans-national external evaluation building on experiences, such as the Tuning project and the Ba/Ma descriptors developed through the Joint Quality Initiative, using common criteria on the basis of an evaluation process in three different discipline fields;
- to identify possible obstacles which derive from trans-national evaluation and indicate strategies that might be used to overcome them;
- to contribute to more visibility, transparency and compatibility in European higher education.

The evaluation will not include ranking but will allow comparability.

1.5 Anticipated benefits from TEEP

The likely benefits from TEEP should include:

For European Higher Education:

- a method for trans-national evaluation building on predefined criteria which are commonly agreed and which have been tested and offer a dimension of transparency and comparability of the quality of programmes across borders;
- a contribution to the development of the subject on the basis of the recommendations from the experts and good practice from comparable programmes in other countries;
- an opportunity to share experiences with other programmes and peers and the possibility of establishing networks to assure continuous improvement of the programme quality;

For the participating institutions:

- the opportunity for the participating institutions to promote both their institution and the programme as such.
- the opportunity to get feedback in order to help them improve their quality assurance culture

2. Self evaluation – process and themes

2.1 Introduction

The following text presents on the one hand practical information and good advice on the self evaluation process, and on the other hand the themes of the self evaluation. Furthermore the text aims to ensure that the information and judgements provided by each of the participating programmes are presented in a consistent way allowing for comparison across the participating programmes.

2.2 Purpose and organisation of the self evaluation process

The first element in the evaluation is the self evaluation process and the preparation of the self evaluation report is designed to serve three distinct aims:

- to provide a framework to stimulate internal discussions on strengths and weaknesses related to the three themes that are the foci for the evaluation. This should provide opportunities to assist a continuous improvement in the quality of the programme;
- to provide comparable documentation to be used by the panel of experts, in their preparations, site visit, evaluations and reports;
- to invite comments on the utility of the criteria when the framework is applied to different programmes delivered within different national context;

The self evaluation reports together with the information gathered during the site visits (more information on the site visits is provided later in this text) constitute the documentation for the evaluation.

2.3 The self evaluation group

The self evaluation report should be prepared by a self evaluation group under the responsibility of a chairperson. The chairperson will be responsible for co-ordinating the work of the self evaluation group, and will normally also be the contact person between the self evaluation group and the responsible quality assurance agency i.e. QAA for History, AQU for Veterinary Sciences, and EVA for Physics.

The self evaluation group (as well as the chairperson) has to be designated officially by the Board/Council/Committee, responsible for the degree programme involved in the quality evaluation.

The self evaluation group is responsible for the preparation of a self evaluation report which should reflect the results of the group's work. It is recommended that the self evaluation group includes at least one representative from each of the relevant stakeholders at the programme level, including management, staff actively involved in teaching, students and administrative staff. Experience suggests that a good and workable size for the group is five to six members.

The value of the self evaluation process is generally found to increase when there is active participation by as many staff and student representatives as practically possible in the discussions and reflections that lead to the production of the report. This wider participation tends to create a higher sense of ownership in the exercise and in the commitment to bring about the changes suggested by both the self evaluation process and report, and through reflection on the external evaluation report provided by the expert group. It is recommended that a draft of the self evaluation report be discussed among as many staff and students / student representatives as possible. This can provide a more holistic picture with different perspectives of the features of the programme.

2.4 The contact person for the self evaluation group

Each participating programme should nominate a contact person to be responsible for the contact with the responsible agency. We recommend that the contact person be the chairperson of the self evaluation group. The name of the contact person, address, e-mail address and telephone and fax number should be sent to the responsible agency.

2.5 The self evaluation report

It is not intended that the self-evaluation report should cover all aspects of the quality of the programmes. Instead, the proposed self evaluation, and the guidelines to preparing the report, concentrate on three areas:

- context
- competences and learning outcomes;
- quality assurance mechanisms.

A good self evaluation report is not only a combination of factual and descriptive data but most importantly, is analytical. The self evaluation report should include reflection and comment on current strategies and practices and include explanations for the choices and priorities made by the programme. An important emphasis of both the process of preparing the report, and the report itself, is consideration of development and improvement; the process and report should reflect on and suggest possible and relevant future changes to programmes.

- The overall self evaluation report should be presented in English, the working language of the project, with a recommended maximum of **20 pages** in A-4 format (minimum 10pt font size), not including the tables with quantitative data, respecting a fair balance between the three areas mentioned above

The report should be delivered in both a printed version and electronically as a word file.

It should be possible to read the report without any help from attached annexes. However, you are invited to present a limited number of annexes or additional information as evidence to support the information in the self evaluation report to the experts at the site visit.

The deadline for submission of the self evaluation reports to the responsible agency is **Friday 4 January 2003**. It is important that the submission date is kept in order to ensure that the overall timeframe of the evaluation can be kept.

The self evaluation reports should be send to:

Discipline Area	Address of submission
History Programmes	Nick Harris The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Southgate House Southgate Street Gloucester GL1 1UB Telephone +44 (0) 1452 557000 Fax +44 (0) 1452 557070 Email : n.harris@qaa.ac.uk

Veterinary Science Programmes	Josep Grifoll AQA Agència per a la Qualitat del Sistema Universitari a Catalunya Via Laietan, 28, 5a planta 08003 Barcelona tel. 93 268 89 50 fax 93 268 89 51 e-mail: jgrifollsauri@agenqua.o
Physics programmes	Tine Holm EVA The Danish Evaluation Institute Østbanegade 55, 3 DK 2100 København V Tel: + 45 35 55 01 01 Fax: + 45 35 55 10 11 Email: tih@eva.dk

The relevant agency is responsible for sending the reports to the expert panels; this should ensure 'version control'

3. The site visit

3.1 Introduction

The site visit is the second element in the evaluation process. The site visit is based on the self evaluation report and is the additional element in the documentation of the evaluation.

3.2 The purpose and organisation of the site visit

The site visits will be conducted in the period from January to March 2003. A representative from the responsible agency will participate in the visit as secretary for the panel. The site visits will last 1 ½ day.

The purpose of the site visit is twofold:

- to allow the experts to get a comprehensive and clear view of the programme through discussions and interviews with main stakeholders, and to clarify aspects of the self evaluation report;
- to elaborate on and discuss the thoughts put forward in the self evaluation report with a broad group of stakeholders.

4. The expert panels

4.1 The panels and their responsibilities

The visiting panel to each institution will comprise 4 members. The panel members will be drawn from a larger pool of 7 to 8 experts but for continuity it is intended that the panel chairperson and secretary will participate in each visit. The panel members will have the opportunity to engage in all aspects of the evaluation although it is hoped that particular expertise in higher education quality management and discipline interest will be reflected in their individual responsibilities within the work of the panel.

Furthermore the visiting panel will include a student member from the country being visited. The role of the student will be to focus on areas and questions related to the interests of the student body as users of the higher education programme. The student representative will be sought identified through the National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB) in consultation with the three discipline-related association or organisations of students.

The panel works as a team although aspects of its work during the visit may be undertaken by parts of the team. The members will, however, not conduct any aspects of the visit on an individual basis.

The panel members will be identified through the ENQA member institutions and the management group (where the SOCRATES Thematic Networks are participating). Proposed panel members for each visit will be selected by the project's management group. All panel members will be provided with information to ensure that they are familiar with the aims, objectives and procedures of the project, and their own roles and tasks within it.

Each panel visit is co-ordinated by the panel chairperson and agency secretary for the discipline area. In the period preceding the visit, the secretary provides advice to the institution on its preparations for the visit, and works with the panel on the initial analysis of documentation. He or she accompanies the team during the visit, providing advice as appropriate. It is the responsibility of the panel chairperson and secretary to test that the team's findings are supported by adequate

and identifiable evidence, and that the panel's report provides information in a succinct and readily accessible form.

5. Intended outcomes and conclusions

5.1 The panel reports

TEEP will result in one report for each of the three disciplines. The reports will be public. The reports will include comments on whether and how the participating programmes appear to be managing quality soundly and effectively and their apparent capacity for and manners in which they fulfil the criteria presented in the project and judgements on the quality of the programmes being offered.

Each discipline report also sets out the panel's views on:

- the characteristics of each programme's approaches and capabilities for managing academic quality with a view to the criteria;
- self evaluation report for each programme;
- opportunities for developmental contributions and activities for each programme.

For each panel a draft report will be prepared and submitted to the participating programmes when all of the visits are finalised. The draft will be made by the team secretary. The institution is asked to provide the secretary with corrections of errors of fact in the draft report and the final report is prepared in the light of the institution's response.

The reports will be completed no later than June 2003.

5.2. The methodological report

Since TEEP is a pilot project for trans-national evaluation that is based on predefined criteria, a report on the methodological experiences, and recommendations for future trans-national evaluations, will be prepared for the European Commission once the evaluation processes are finalised. The report will be prepared by the project group and commented by the management group. This report will also be public.

As mentioned in the introduction to the self evaluation, one of the purposes of the self evaluation is for the participating programmes to reflect on the method and the usefulness of the criteria employed. These reflections should be included at the end of each of the self evaluation reports as they will feed into the preparation of the methodological report.

EVALUATION THEMES

A. Context

Definition:

The context refers to all those characteristics, in terms of regulation, organisation, available resources and environment that make the delivery of a programme possible.

1. Regulations and programme approval procedures

- 1.1 Explain how the programme is approved and what the respective roles of the different bodies involved in an approval process are.
- 1.2 Present the context in which the authorities (Regulatory bodies, University, Faculty, Departments) are developing the Bachelor/Master structure that is part of the European recommendations towards greater visibility, transparency and compatibility in higher education.
- 1.3 Present the structure of the programme e.g. in the form of a chart, and the profile of the programme e.g. in the form of a brochure.

2. Academic staff

- 2.1 To what extent do the profile of the academic staff match to the aims of the programme?
- 2.2 Describe and assess how the academic staff are recruited and promoted.
- 2.3 Does the institution/faculty have a general programme for the development of academic staff, including how it will meet its possible needs in 2010?

3. Student population

- 3.1 Describe and assess the size and profile of the student population of the programme, taken on the basis of the data in Annex 1 and taking into consideration those of the following that are relevant:
 - Number of applicants and admitted students
 - Selection mechanisms (if appropriate)
 - Student entry qualifications
 - Full-time / part-time students ratios
 - students per teacher ratio
- 3.2 Describe and assess the progression and completion rates for full-time, first cycle degree / Bachelor students in History and Physics, and for Veterinary Science full degree / masters students. Failure rates and dropout levels should also be considered.
- 3.3 Describe and assess, if possible, the employment rates for full-time first cycle degree /Bachelor students in History and Physics, and for Veterinary Science full degree / Masters student, 3 years after graduation.

4. Programme scenario

4.1 Describe and assess the strategic situation of the programme in relation to the University as a whole or other programmes in the faculty, taking into consideration the following points and the data in Annex 1, if relevant:

- Intake of students
- Total number of students
- Teaching capacity and products
- Social-economic and cultural environment
-

4.2 Describe and assess the organisational model of the programme on the basis of the data in Annex 1 and in terms of:

- Departments involved in the programme
- Structure of services and administrative staff profiles
- Efficiency level in the co-ordination mechanisms of academic activities among the departments involved.

B: Competences and learning outcomes

Definition of competences

The concept of competences used in this project follows the integrated approach employed by the Tuning Project. In line one of Tuning, competences and skills are understood as including **knowing and understanding** (theoretical knowledge of an academic field, the capacity to know and understand), **knowing how to act** (practical and operational application of knowledge to certain situations), **knowing how to be** (values as an integral element of the way of perceiving and living with others and in a social context).

Competences represent a combination of attributes (with respect to knowledge and its application,, skills, responsibilities and attitudes) and are additionally used here in a description of the level or extent to which a person is capable of performing them.

In this context, a competency or a set of competences mean that a person can demonstrate a certain capacity or skill and perform a task, and in a way that allows evaluation of the level of achievement. Competences can be carried out and assessed. Thus, a person does not either possess or lack a competence, but commands it to a varying degree, so that competences can be placed on a continuum.

For this project competences are divided into two sets: those competences which are **subject-area related** and the so-called **generic competences (skills and knowledge)**. Those referred to as academic-subject-related skills and competences are crucial for any degree and are intimately related to a specific knowledge of a field of study. These give identity and consistency to the particular degree programme. For inspiration the subject-area related competences defined by the Tuning project for History, Physics and Veterinary Science will be distributed at the launch seminar the 1-2. October 2002.

Both the Tuning project and the shared qualification descriptors, that were developed within the Joint Quality Initiative, include generic components which can taken into consideration for all degree programmes in transnational evaluation, whatever the disciplinary area. The so-called generic competences (skills and knowledge) include attributes like the capacity to learn, the capacity for analysis and syntheses etc. which are common to all or most of degree qualifications. In relation to the Tuning project a list of 30 generic competences was identified and included in the definitive questionnaire. The list is enclosed as Annex 3; it should only be regarded as a reference to help programmes identifying the generic competences relevant for each specific programme.

Definition of learning outcomes

A learning outcome is a statement of what competences a student is expected to possess as a result of the learning process.

1. Aims and outcomes

1.1 What are the expected competences/intended outcomes of the programme (please specify which are subject-related and which are generic competences)?

1.2 Are the expected competences /intended learning outcomes for the programme:

- a) defined;
- b) published or available to students and staff?

- 1.3 To what extent are the expected competences/intended learning outcomes for the programme designed to reflect the aims of the programme, and also the progression within the programme taking into account the abilities of the students at entry?
- 1.4 How have the goals for competences been developed, eg. through international academic cooperation or labour market contacts?
- Describe to what extent the goals include aims for academic-subject-related competences/ qualifications, as well as generic competences

2. Programme content (curriculum)

- 2.1 To what extent do the design and content of the curricula encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of subject-specific skills and generic skills, employment and/or further study?
- 2.2 What actions are taken to ensure that the design and organisation of the curriculum is effective in promoting student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes?
- 2.3 To what extent are the curriculum contents assessed to ensure that they enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes?
- 2.4 What evidence is there that the curricular content and design is informed by recent developments in techniques of teaching and learning, by current research and scholarship, and by any changes in relevant occupational and professional requirements?

3. Subject related competences

- 3.1 To what extent are the subject related competences obtained through compulsory subjects?
- e.g. describe the compulsory subjects and the proportion of these courses in the overall programme

	In ECTS (or proportion of the programme)
Core content	
Course units which can be chosen by the student from a predefined list	
Course units, which are totally left to the free choice of the student	
Final project/thesis work	
Other compulsory elements (exams, project work, seminars, placement)	

- 3.2 Which basic disciplines underpin the subject-related competences in the programme?
- 3.3 To what extent is the programme characterised by progression in the sense that it comprises a coherent set of courses or modules that enable students to learn the basic of disciplinary area in the beginning and then widen and deepen their experience in the high level courses?
- 3.4 To what extent does the content of the programme reflect breadth and depth in relation to the discipline area, including a description and assessment of:
the fundamental knowledge of various approaches to the disciplinary area that students will obtain throughout the programme?
the opportunities for study areas at a more advanced level?

3.5 If included within the programme, summarise the requirements for any project work or literature review in which there is a greater expectation of student autonomy and some development of their investigative / research skills? (Where present such work is often towards the end of the programme.)

4. Generic Competences

4.1 To what extent are students supported in developing their generic competences (such as a capacity to learn, a capacity for analysis and syntheses, communicative skills etc.; see Annex 3 for the Tuning project list of skills and competences) throughout their programme?

4.2 To what extent does the composition of the methods of teaching and learning support the realisation of the generic competences mentioned above?

5. Teaching/learning methods and strategies

5.1 Describe the teaching/learning methods and strategies of the programme and evaluate their effectiveness.

If possible, fill in the table below. Please refer to the glossary in the annex in order to use an agreed terminology; if the categories listed do not described the teaching/learning formats used in the programme, please explain exactly what is meant by 'seminar', 'coursework' and so forth in your system.

Teaching/learning methods of the programme, proportional

	1. Year	2. Year	3. Year	4. Year (only vet.)	5. Year (only vet.)
Lectures					
Small group teaching					
Seminars					
Coursework					
Projects					
Laboratory experiments					
Trainee position					
Other					
In total	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

5.2 Do you assess whether the teaching and learning methods enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes/required competences? And if so, how?

5.3 To what extent are students involved in planning of the teaching and learning strategies and developments if the learning context?

6. Assessment

6.1 To what extent does the assessment process enable learners to demonstrate achievement of the intended outcomes?

6.2 Please describe the different assessment methods of the programme, including their relative proportions

Assessment Methods	1. Year	2. Year	3. Year	4. Year (only vet.)	5. Year (only vet.)
Written examination					
Assessed coursework					
Laboratory experiment write-ups					
Essays					
Oral examination					
Coursework reports					
Project reports					
Presentation					
In total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

C Quality Assurance Mechanisms

Definition:

Quality assurance mechanisms refer to the availability and use of procedures for regular (internal) systematic assessment of the programme as a whole, parts of the programme and individual courses. In this regard the rationale behind the evaluation, dissemination of and follow-up on evaluation results are included.

1. Strategy and goals

- 1.1 Describe your overall strategy for quality assurance if it has been formulated. (If it exists, provide references to relevant documents where the strategy is described.)
- 1.2 Describe to what extent separate goals exist for quality assurance at programme and thematic/course level.

2. Process

- 2.1 How are quality assurance aspects of the programme organised and monitored with regards to:
 - a) the capacity of the programme to remain current and valid in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline and practise in its application;
 - b) the continuing relevance of the curriculum;
 - c) ensuring that appropriate actions are taken to remedy any identified shortcomings.
- 2.2 How is the programme evaluated with regards to:
 - a) any reports from accrediting or other external bodies;
 - b) staff and student feedback, eg. teacher evaluations;
 - c) feedback from former students and their employees;
 - d) professional organisations, labour market representatives or discipline associations;
 - e) student progress information;
 - f) other (e.g. external examiners reports).

Please, state if the different types of documentation (from a-f) are used systematically.

- 2.3 Is the responsibility for quality assurance clearly placed within the organisation?
- If so, describe how and where
- 2.4 To whom is the quality assurance strategy available?
- 2.5 How are students and teaching staff involved in discussing improvements in programme quality?

3. Rationale

- 3.1 What is the rationale behind the chosen quality assurance strategy (e.g. changes in student demand, external expectations, developments in teaching and learning, new research areas)?

4. Results

- 4.1 To what extent are results of evaluations (e.g. programme, course evaluations, other) documented and disseminated to teaching staff and students?

4.2 Describe how the quality assurance mechanisms have resulted in improvement and changes to the programme and courses (provide examples).

4.3 How have staff, students and other stakeholders benefited from the quality assurance activities undertaken? (provide examples)

5. Follow-up and improvement

5.1 Describe to what extent departmental management prepares plans for follow-up on evaluation results (enclose an example of such plan).

5.2 Describe to what extent responsibility for follow-up on evaluations is clearly assigned within the institution

5.3 Consider and state how the quality assurance review practices could be more effective and efficient.

D Reflections on the criteria

In order to improve the quality of the criteria, the self-assessment group is requested to reflect upon the extent to which the criteria have appeared to be:

- *understandable and clearly formulated;*
- *relevant*, considering present goals and developments within the programme;
- *adequate* in terms of areas covered;
- *internally consistent;*
- *precise enough to allow for a proper assessment.*

The groups are also asked to provide suggestions for revision, amendments and re-phrasing of the criteria, where they think it appropriate.

The criteria are presented in full in annex 2.

List of annexes

Annex 1: Data tables

Annex 2: The criteria

Annex 3: The Tuning project

Annex 4: Glossary

Annex 5: The management group

Annex 1: Data tables: context

Please specify how the data has been calculated

1. Details of the Programme

Name of the University (in English)	
Name of the University (in national language)	
Name of Faculty/Department /Unit responsible for the programme (in English)	
Name of Faculty/Department /Unit responsible for the programme (in national language)	
Address	
Name of the programme	
Telephone	
Fax	
Title and name of the head of programme	
Website	

1.2 Provide a diagram of the administrative structures showing the programme in relation to the university

1.3 Provide a diagram of the internal administrative structure of the programme itself (with relations to councils, committees, departments, etc.)

1.4 Present briefly the responsibilities, the formal mandates and functions of the main administrative bodies (councils, committees, etc.)

1.5 Indicate the rules concerning the appointment of the officials of the programme (Dean, Vice-dean, Heads of departments, etc).

1.6 Information about the programme

Total number of academic years	
Number of credits / annual number of lectures per year *	
Compulsory percentage of the total number of credits	
Number of electives (%)	
Mandatory courses under professional regulations	
Year of approval of the programme	
University / Faculty ownership (public / private)	
European directives affecting the programme	
Other regulations	

* Consider ECTS or specify the conversion rule.

2. Information on students at programme level

2.1 Intake of students

Year	Applicants	Admitted Male / Female / Foreign students	Entry requirements
2000-2001			
2001-2002			
2002-2003			

2.2 Student flow

Of the students whose admission year was 1997 (in case of full degree/master) and 1999 (in case of first degree/bachelor) how many were at present (five/ three years later) in 2001:

First year (1997/1999)	
Second year (1998/2000)	
Third year (1999/2001)	
Fourth year (2000)	
Fifth year (2001)	
How many have graduated	
How many have dropped out	
How many are not in any identifiable year (For those students who cannot be placed in one specific academic year)	

2.3 Graduation

If the prescribed time for student graduation is N years, how many have completed in the prescribed time, how many within N+1 (within one year after prescribed time)

% Graduation in N		
% Graduation in N+1 year		
% Graduation in N+2 years		
% Drop-out	In the first year	Total

2.4 Information on students at an institutional level

Evolution	University
2001	
Students enrolled	
Intake students	

3. Information on staff

3.1 Number of academic staff in number of persons and full-time equivalents, 2001 attached to the programme.

	Number of persons	Full-time equivalents
Full Professors		
Associate professors		
Assistant professors		
Research assistants		
Teaching assistants		
PhDs.		
Other categories		
Academic staff in total		

3.2 Number of support staff to the programme and the academic staff in number of persons and full-time equivalents

	Number of persons	Full-time equivalents
Technical and Administrative staff		

Annex 2: The use and formulation of Criteria

In national evaluations of educational programmes quality is often assessed in terms of the extent to which the individual programmes achieve their own goals, and the legal regulations under which they operate. This approach commonly referred to as assessing the 'fitness for purpose'.

The goals of the programmes participating in this trans-national evaluation, and the legal framework under which they operate, differ and the use of such a 'fitness for purpose' approach would not have enabled the intended outcomes of TEEP. These are a comparative assessment of the extent to which the programmes identify commonly relevant and similar goals. The application and critical assessment of pre-defined criteria is an important part of the project in both ensuring the comparative dimension, and assisting the development of a common reference framework for future trans-national evaluations and comparisons..

The criteria have been formulated with reference to a number of different sources. Overall the objectives of the Bologna declaration and the agreements reached at the Prague meeting have constituted one important reference point for the formulation of the specific criteria. Another important source for the formulation of criteria has been the Tuning Project. This dimension is considered a crucial part of the project, and is designed to ensure a knowledge transfer from the Tuning project to, and beyond, the TEEP project. Additionally, it should assist the development of quality assurance processes in which European institutions can follow the same or similar paths and thus facilitate comparability.

Further criteria have been formulated on the basis on the Bachelor and Master descriptors (the Ba/Ma descriptors formulated by the Joint Quality Initiative (<http://www.jointquality.org>)). This developmental activity has been undertaken in line with the Bologna declaration that proposes the introduction, within a European higher education space, of a system of qualifications in higher (tertiary) education that is based on two cycles.

In addition, existing international evaluation models using common quality criteria, and the criteria used in the recent international comparative evaluations mentioned in point 1.2, have been used in the preparation of the criteria proposed for TEEP. Finally, the formulation has rested upon the experience and knowledge that the European Network of Quality Assurance Agencies has gained from the implementation of numerous evaluations of higher education programmes.

The criteria for competences focus on the formulation of goals, their relevance and consistency with programme content, and the extent to which the goals were developed considering the needs and requirements of the labour market. The criteria are particularly concerned with the actual content of the programmes in terms of subject-related and generic competences, a terminology that was applied within the Tuning Project.

The criteria for first cycle degree/Bachelors programmes, and for second cycle degree/Masters, correspond directly to the formulated objectives in the Bologna Declaration. The development of the the BaMa descriptors suggested that they might be shared within Europe and be available for a variety of purposes depending on particular national, regional or institutional contexts and requirements. Each descriptor indicates an overarching summary of the outcomes of a whole programme of study. The descriptor is concerned with the totality of the study, and a student's abilities and attributes that have resulted in the award of the qualification. This implies that a part of the criteria concentrate on the learning outcomes of the programme.

Finally, the criteria associated with the area of quality assurance mechanisms are primarily formulated to provide a basis for an analysis of the comparability of the systems and procedures applied at the participating programmes. This will be done in terms of strategies, procedures and systems for quality assurance.

The formulated criteria have been developed from many different sources and previous experiences. It will, however, be essential to take into account the specific conditions which apply to their application within the conduct of any trans-national evaluation. First of all, the considerable differences in terms of e.g. educational cultures, national traditions and regulatory systems within

which the individual programmes operate must to be considered. Secondly, the aim of developing a methodology for trans-national evaluations implies an obligation to ensure that the criteria are formulated to be flexible enough to allow them to be replicated to other international evaluations of programmes with a comparative perspective. Thirdly, the variation in programme content offers a significant challenge for developing commonly-relevant criteria that at the same time allow the expressions of individual priorities and qualities.

To overcome these obstacles and to assure a high level of common applicability and relevance, a framework for criteria formulation has been developed.

Criteria Requirements

The following requirements have driven the formulation of the draft set of criteria with regards to their character and content:

- *Broadness*: the criteria must be formulated broadly enough to allow for variations that ensure that the criteria respect specific national traditions, concerns and priorities and do not hinder diversity.
- *Uniformity*: the set of criteria should be the same for all the programmes participating in the evaluation. In this way it is assured that the programmes are assessed on equal grounds, and that the assessments are transparent, so that a comparative perspective is enabled.
- *Reference to level*: in order to be able to operate with one set of criteria, the criteria have to be formulated with reference to the BSc as a level of academic achievement, irrespective of the variations in the nominal duration.
- *Precision*: the criteria must be precise enough to allow an assessment of the extent to which they are fulfilled by the individual programmes.
- *Internal consistency*: the set of criteria must be internally coherent.
- *Topicality*: the criteria must reflect present objectives and developments within the area of higher education in Europe.

As described in point 1.4, the purpose of the self-evaluation evaluation is two-fold. The criteria are considered as a reference frame for assessing the quality of the trans-national programmes. The criteria are also formulated in a manner to ensure a high level of common applicability and relevance for the three discipline areas.

In order to improve the quality of the criteria, the self-assessment group is requested to reflect upon the extent to which the criteria have appeared to be:

- *understandable and clearly formulated*;
- *relevant*, considering present goals and developments within the programme;
- *adequate* in terms of areas covered;
- *internally consistent*;
- *precise enough to allow for a proper assessment*.

The groups are also asked to provide suggestions for revision, amendments and re-phrasing of the criteria, where they think it appropriate.

A. Criteria for competences and learning outcomes

1. Aims and outcomes

- The goals for competences of graduates are clearly formulated, publicly available and consistent with the degree title
- The goals are realistic and achievable considering the nominal duration of the programme and initial level of the student
- The goals are formulated and developed considering the needs and requirements of the labour market
- The goals not only consist of aims for subject related qualifications but also aims for generic skills
- The goals specify the intended mixture of theoretical orientation and practical orientation as well as the intended balance between depth and breadth of the programme content
- Programme aims are used to promote understanding about the programme outcomes and the other strategies used to communicate information of this type
- The goals for competences are communicated and known by student, staff etc.

2. Programme content

- The content of the programme is clearly formulated and publicly available
- The composition of the courses and the curriculum are consistent with the goals for competences
- The basic disciplines and approaches that underpin the qualification in the discipline area are clearly formulated.
- The subject-related competences are achieved through the programme
- The programme is characterised by progression in the sense that it comprises a coherent set of courses or other educational modules that enable students to gain basic knowledge the discipline area in the beginning and widen and deepen their experience in the advanced level courses
- The content reflects breadth and depth in relation to subject. Breadth means that the students develop fundamental knowledge of various approaches to the discipline area. Depth requires the study of at least one area at a more advanced level.
- Evidence is provided that the curriculum supports the progressive development of the intended outcomes.

3. Subject related competences

- The subject-related competences can be obtained through the compulsory subjects
- Basic disciplines underpin the subject-related competences in the programme
- The programme is characterised by progression in the sense that it comprises a coherent set of courses or modules that enable students to gain basic knowledge of the discipline area in the beginning and widen and deepen their experience in the upper level courses
- The content of the programme reflects breadth and depth in relation to the discipline field, including a description and assessment of:

the fundamental knowledge of various approaches to the discipline field that students will obtain throughout the programme?

the opportunities for study areas at a more advanced level?

4. Generic competences

- Students can, throughout the programme, obtain the generic competences such as capacity to learn, the capacity for analysis and syntheses, communicative skills etc.
- The composition of the methods of teaching and learning support the achievement of the generic competences as listed in annex 3 or as determined by the self evaluation group as mentioned above.

5. Descriptors for first and second degree

- **First cycle degrees (Bachelor's or equivalent)** are awarded to students who have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon and supersedes their general secondary education, and is typically at a level that, whilst supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge of the forefront of their field of study;

can apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional¹ approach to their work or vocation, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study;

have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgements that include reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical issues;

can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences;

have developed those learning skills that are necessary for them to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.

- **Second cycle degrees (Master's degrees or equivalent)** are awarded to students who have demonstrated knowledge and understanding that is founded upon and extends and/or enhances that typically associated with first degree level, and that provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas, often within a research⁴ context;

can apply their knowledge and understanding, and problem solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to their field of study;

have the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgements with incomplete or limited information, but that include reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgements;

can communicate their conclusions, and the knowledge and rationale underpinning these, to specialist and non-specialist audiences clearly and unambiguously;

have the learning skills to allow them to continue to study in a manner that may be largely self-directed or autonomous.

6. Teaching/learning methods and strategies

- A strategy for the teaching/learning methods of the programme is formulated and used
- The different teaching and learning methods encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of discipline-specific skills and generic skills, employment and/or further study, and personal development
- Teaching and learning methods enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes
- Students are involved in a) development of teaching and learning strategies; b) appraisal of their implementation

7. Assessment

- Assessment processes enable learners to demonstrate achievement of the intended outcomes
- The assessment strategy ensures an adequate formative function in developing student abilities

B. Quality assurance criteria

1. Programmes should have a formulated quality assurance strategy to:

- ensure that programmes remain current and valid in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application;
 - ensure that appropriate actions are taken to remedy any identified shortcomings.
 - ensure that programmes are current and valid in the light of international developments
- when programmes review the extent to which the original programme aims and intended outcomes remain appropriate, considerations might include, for example:
- the cumulative effect of changes made over time, as a result of regular monitoring, to the design and operation of the programme
 - current research and practice in the application of knowledge in the relevant discipline(s), technological advances, and developments in teaching and learning
 - changes to external points of reference, such as subject benchmark statements, relevant professional or statutory body requirements
 - changes in student demand, employer expectations and employment opportunities
 - the achievements of student cohorts

2. Programmes should involve students, staff and other stakeholders in their quality assurance practices.

For instance by using:

- any reports from accrediting or other external bodies;
- staff and student feedback;
- feedback from former students and their employers;
- feedback from international partner institutions;
- student progress information;
- other feedback (e.g. external examiners' reports);

and by:

- making the quality assurance strategy available to students and teaching staff;
- involving students and staff in discussing improvement of programme quality;
- disseminating results of quality assurance to students and staff.

3. Programmes evaluate the effectiveness of their quality assurance practices and seek improvement according to these results.

Programmes consider:

- the benefits gained by the programme, staff, students and other stakeholders from quality assurance activities undertaken;
- how the processes promote enhancement and disseminate good practice;
- opportunities to make review practices more effective and efficient.

4. Within the institution there are clearly assigned divisions of responsibility for quality assurance, to the level of the programme

regarding;

- formulation of quality assurance strategy;
- process of quality assurance;
- involvement of students, staff and other stakeholders;
- follow-up on the results of quality assurance;
- dissemination of results of quality assurance;
- improvement in practice.

Annex 3: Tuning project: skills and competences

In the project Tuning Education Structures in Europe a list of 85 different skills and competences in the field of generic skills and competences was identified. They were regarded as relevant by institutions of higher education or companies in over twenty studies. The competences were categorised as instrumental, interpersonal and systemic competences. The initial questionnaire for graduates and employers in the tuning-subjects proposed a balanced representation of competences from all three groups: instrumental, interpersonal and systemic competences considered important to study – accumulated into a list of following 30 competences:

Instrumental competences

- Capacity for analysis and synthesis
- Capacity for organization and planning
- Basic general knowledge
- Grounding in basic knowledge of the profession
- Oral and written communication in your native language
- Information management skills (ability to retrieve and analyse information from different sources)
- Knowledge of a second language
- Elementary computing skills
- Problem solving
- Decision-making

Interpersonal competences

- Critical and self-critical abilities
- Teamwork
- Interpersonal skills
- Ability to work in an interdisciplinary team
- Ability to communicate with experts in other fields
- Appreciation of diversity and multicultural aspects
- Ability to work in an international context
- Ethical commitment

Systemic competences

- Research skills
- Capacity to learn
- Capacity for applying knowledge in practice
- Capacity to adapt to new situations
- Capacity for generating new ideas (creativity)
- Leadership
- Ability to work autonomously
- Project design and management
- Initiative and entrepreneurial spirit
- Concern for quality
- Understanding of cultures and customs of other countries
- Will to succeed

Annex 4: Glossary

Bachelors degree: a qualification that, in the context of the Bologna Process, marks the end of the first cycle of higher education and typically would allow, but not necessarily guarantee, entry to the second cycle study that could lead to a Masters degree.

Competences: (see B: Competences and learning outcomes).

Course unit: a self-contained, formally structures learning experience with a coherent and explicit set of learning outcomes.

Coursework: work undertaken and assessed within a study programme, and that contributes in a summative or formative manner to the overall grade awarded.

Department: part of a university that is responsible for the teaching, learning and administration of an academic subject.

Discipline (area): a defined area of academic study that may draw upon more than one subject (area) / department.

Electives: a course to be chosen from a predetermined list.

Faculty: a (group) of university department(s) concerned with a major division of knowledge.

First cycle degree: First higher education qualification taken by the student. It is awarded after the successful completion of first cycle studies which, according to the Bologna Declaration, should normally last a minimum of 180 ECTS.

Learning outcomes: (see B: Competences and learning outcomes).

Lecture: Provision of content by presentation and explanation (possibly including demonstration) by a lecturer.

Masters degree: a second cycle qualification (originally giving authority to teach in a university) that requires demonstration of competences and skills at a defined and higher level than those associated with Bachelors degrees, and requires a minimum of 1 year of further study to a Bachelor's degree, and typically more (e.g. 90 ECTS).

Presentation: a personal demonstration (to others) of competences and skills; may be as an individual or as part of a team.

Programme: An approved set of courses or modules recognised for the award of a specific degree.

Project: A piece of work assigned to a single student or a group of students to be carried out.

Second cycle degree: Second higher education qualification taken by a student after the first degree. It is awarded after the successful completion of second cycle studies and may involve some research work.

Seminar: A period of instruction based on written and oral contributions by the learners.

Subject (area): a defined field of academic study typically covered by one department.

Thesis: A formally presented written report, based on independent research work, which is required for the award of a degree.

Annex 5: The management group

ENQA Steering Group:

Christian Thune (MG Chairman)

Ton Vroeijenstijn

Project agencies:

Nick Harris (The Quality Assurance Agency, UK)

Dorte Kristoffersen, (The Danish Evaluation Institute)

Tine Holm (rapporteur) (The Danish Evaluation Institute)

Gemma Rauret (Agencia per la Qualitat del Sistema Universitaria Catalunya)

Chairs of Thematic Networks:

Katherin Isaacs (The History Network)

Hendrik Ferdinande (The Physics Network)

Tito Horacio Fernandes (The Veterinary Science Network).

The European Commission:

Peter van der Hijden

Secretary:

Karl Holm (ENQA secretariat)

The Project group:

Nick Harris (The Quality Assurance Agency, UK)

Dorte Kristoffersen (The Danish Evaluation Institute)

Tine Holm (The Danish Evaluation Institute)

Josep Grifoll (Agencia per la Qualitat del Sistema Universitaria Catalunya)

Gemma Rauret (Agencia per la Qualitat del Sistema Universitaria Catalunya)